

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOI/PA
DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
FOI/PA# 1218644-0

Total Deleted Page(s) = 14

Page 20 ~ b5; b6; b7C;
Page 21 ~ b5; b6; b7C;
Page 24 ~ b5;
Page 25 ~ b1; b3; b5;
Page 26 ~ b5;
Page 27 ~ b5;
Page 28 ~ b1; b3; b5;
Page 29 ~ b1; b3; b5;
Page 30 ~ Duplicate;
Page 31 ~ Duplicate;
Page 32 ~ Duplicate;
Page 33 ~ Duplicate;
Page 34 ~ Duplicate;
Page 35 ~ Duplicate;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s) X
X No Duplication Fee X
X For this Page X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Thank you [redacted] Will let you know if I hear anything back.

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2012 3:25 PM
To: [redacted] (IR) (FBI); [redacted] (IR) (FBI); [redacted] (OTD)(FBI); [redacted]
(DO) (FBI); [redacted] (FD)(FBI); [redacted] (FD) (FBI); [redacted] (CD)(FBI)
Cc: CURTIN, ROYCE E (DO)(FBI)
Subject: Revised Draft Surveillance Report to Congress
Importance: High

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET~~ //NOFORN

Classified By: F66M79K53

Declassify On: 20370316

Derived From: Multiple Sources

Hi all,

Attached is my effort to incorporate the additional material your divisions provided, at AD Kelly's request, into the Surveillance Report to Congress called for in the 2012 Intel Authorization Bill.

<< File: FY 2012 Intel Auth-Surveillance-3-12-v3.docx >>

Please let me know by COB Monday, March 19, if your executives are okay with the portions of the report that affect your programs, or if I have messed anything up.

Thank you!

- [redacted]

[redacted]

Special Assistant to the EAD

Criminal, Cyber, Response and Services Branch

[redacted] (desk)

[redacted] (blackberry)

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET~~ //NOFORN

targeted oversees. The back-drop to this was the drone strike against al-Awlaki. Earlier this month, Feb. 2013, NBC news reported on this extra-territorial criteria in response to a "leaked DOJ white paper" that they had recently obtained. The issue also came up in the Brennan confirmation hearings. Below is the relevant portion from the 2012 hearing transcript. If this is not the question posed to the Director that you were thinking of, let me know and I will look further. thanks



hac030712.docx

From: [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 11:48 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

~~Classified By: C45W77B94~~
~~Derived From: Multiple Sources~~
~~Declassify On: 20381231~~
=====

[REDACTED]

During the Hotwash, I mentioned a report re: FBI surveillance capacity. The classified report is attached.

b6
b7C
b7E

On page 4 of the report is this:

(U//FOUO) In remote locations where manned aircraft are deemed too detectable, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) platforms can be used to provide surveillance capabilities. The recently enacted Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-95) requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish rules that would allow law enforcement access to specific airspace within the continental United States for certain aircraft, including UAVs. The FBI will work with the Department of Justice and partner law enforcement agencies to pursue appropriate use of this authority as a force multiplier in connection with our other surveillance tools.

Following are the Brennan QFR responses I mentioned.

Limitations on Drone Strikes

In the recently released, unclassified white paper, DOJ writes that "the United States retains its authority to use force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces outside of the area

of active hostilities when it targets a senior operational leader of the enemy forces who is actively engaged in planning operations to kill Americans."

- **Could the Administration carry out drone strikes inside the United States?**

This Administration has not carried out drone strikes inside the United States and has no intention of doing so. I defer to the Departments of Justice and Defense on what legal authorities may apply to using military-level force inside the United States, but the United States only carries out drone strikes where other countries are unable or unwilling to address the threat posed by terrorists—and that is not an issue we have inside the United States.

- **Could you describe the geographical limits on the Administration's conduct of drone strikes?**

As I noted in my speech at Harvard Law School in September 2011, and the Attorney General stated publicly last March, we do not view our authority to use military force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces in this conflict as being limited to "hot" battlefields like Afghanistan. Al-Qa'ida is a stateless enemy that can shift operations from country to country, and consequently al Qaeda and its associates have in the recent past directed several attacks against us from countries other than Afghanistan. The Government has a responsibility to protect against these attacks, and, thus, as the Attorney General has noted, "neither Congress nor our federal courts has limited the geographic scope of our ability to use force to the current conflict in Afghanistan."

This does not mean, however, that we use military force and conduct drone strikes whenever we want or wherever we want. International legal principles, such as respect for another nation's sovereignty, constrain our ability to act unilaterally. Consistent with international legal principles, however, we could use military force in foreign territory with, for example, the consent of the relevant nation—or if or when other governments are unwilling or unable to deal effectively with a threat to the United States.

Please let me know if you have questions.

[redacted]

Special Counsel
Office of Congressional Affairs

[redacted]

Room 7244 (for mail, use Room 7240)

b6
b7C

<< File: ~~SECRET~~ SurveillanceRpt_033012.pdf >>

=====

Classification: ~~SECRET~~ // NOFORN

=====

Classification: ~~SECRET~~ // NOFORN

From: [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 7:11 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: FW: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: J78J43T20
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231

=====
More info on the drone issue...I don't think you'll have to do much research. I have one more email from [REDACTED] w/her info. I believe we'll have enough content to actually put a substantial Q/A paper together.

b6
b7C

UC [REDACTED]
Special Projects Unit
Office of Congressional Affairs
Office [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 5:49 PM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: FW: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: C71W88B15
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231

=====

[REDACTED]
2013 BAR (2).pdf

Page 58-60 of the Bureau Aviation Regulations (BAR)-attached- outlines the FBI's use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS's).

[REDACTED]
b7E

[REDACTED]

b7E

[REDACTED]

b7E

They were used in the recent Hostage taking in AL, and are currently being used for [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b7E

[REDACTED]

b7E

Please let me know if you need any more information.

Thanks-

[REDACTED]

b6

b7C

From: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 3:21 PM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI);
[REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6

b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: J78J13P65
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231
=====

Also from the hot wash: you recalled the Director being asked a question about domestic drone strikes or something similar. I thought I recalled something like that too. This is what I was thinking of:

At HAC-CJS hearing on 3/7/12, the Director was asked about the domestic applicability of criteria the AG had discussed in an academic forum re extra-territorial use of lethal force against U.S. citizens. Earlier that week, 03/05/12, the AG had given a speech at Northwestern University School of Law and discussed criteria where a U.S. citizen could be targeted overseas. The back-drop to this was the drone strike against al-Awlaki. Earlier this month, Feb. 2013, NBC news reported on this extra-territorial criteria in response to a

"leaked DOJ white paper" that they had recently obtained. The issue also came up in the Brennan confirmation hearings. Below is the relevant portion from the 2012 hearing transcript. If this is not the question posed to the Director that you were thinking of, let me know and I will look further. thanks



hac030712.docx

From: [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 11:48 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET~~//NOFORN

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET~~//NOFORN

Classified By: C45W77B94
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231

=====

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C
b7E

During the Hotwash, I mentioned a report re: FBI surveillance capacity. The classified report is attached.

On page 4 of the report is this:

(U//FOUO) In remote locations where manned aircraft are deemed too detectable, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) platforms can be used to provide surveillance capabilities. The recently enacted Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-95) requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish rules that would allow law enforcement access to specific airspace within the continental United States for certain aircraft, including UAVs. The FBI will work with the Department of Justice and partner law enforcement agencies to pursue appropriate use of this authority as a force multiplier in connection with our other surveillance tools.

Following are the Brennan QFR responses I mentioned.

Limitations on Drone Strikes

In the recently released, unclassified white paper, DOJ writes that "the United States retains its authority to use force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces outside of the area of active hostilities when it targets a senior operational leader of the enemy forces who is activity engaged in planning operations to kill Americans."

- Could the Administration carry out drone strikes inside the United States?

This Administration has not carried out drone strikes inside the United States and has no intention of doing so. I defer to the Departments of Justice and Defense on what legal authorities may apply to using military-level force inside the United States, but the United States only carries out drone strikes where other countries are unable or unwilling to address the threat posed by terrorists—and that is not an issue we have inside the United States.

- Could you describe the geographical limits on the Administration's conduct of drone strikes?

As I noted in my speech at Harvard Law School in September 2011, and the Attorney General stated publicly last March, we do not view our authority to use military force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces in this conflict as being limited to "hot" battlefields like Afghanistan. Al-Qa'ida is a stateless enemy that can shift operations from country to country, and consequently al Qaeda and its associates have in the recent past directed several attacks against us from countries other than Afghanistan. The Government has a responsibility to protect against these attacks, and, thus, as the Attorney General has noted, "neither Congress nor our federal courts has limited the geographic scope of our ability to use force to the current conflict in Afghanistan."

This does not mean, however, that we use military force and conduct drone strikes whenever we want or wherever we want. International legal principles, such as respect for another nation's sovereignty, constrain our ability to act unilaterally. Consistent with international legal principles, however, we could use military force in foreign territory with, for example, the consent of the relevant nation—or if or when other governments are unwilling or unable to deal effectively with a threat to the United States.

Please let me know if you have questions.



Special Counsel
Office of Congressional Affairs



Room 7244 (for mail, use Room 7240)



~~SECRET~~ Surveillance
eRpt_033012....

b6
b7C

=====
Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

=====
Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

From: [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 7:12 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: FW: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: J78J43T20
Derived From: ~~Multiple Sources~~
Declassify On: 20381231

=====
Per my prior email...

UC [REDACTED]
Special Projects Unit
Office of Congressional Affairs
Office [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

From: [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 4:25 PM
To: [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: C45W77B94
Derived From: ~~Multiple Sources~~
Declassify On: 20381231

=====
Sorry, [REDACTED] I should have done this initially.

[REDACTED]
Special Counsel
Office of Congressional Affairs
[REDACTED]
Room 7244 (for mail, use Room 7240)

b6
b7C

From: [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 11:48 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)

b6
b7C

Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: C45W77B94
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231
=====

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C
b7E

During the Hotwash, I mentioned a report re: FBI surveillance capacity. The classified report is attached.

On page 4 of the report is this:

(U//FOUO) In remote locations where manned aircraft are deemed too detectable, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) platforms can be used to provide surveillance capabilities. The recently enacted Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-95) requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish rules that would allow law enforcement access to specific airspace within the continental United States for certain aircraft, including UAVs. The FBI will work with the Department of Justice and partner law enforcement agencies to pursue appropriate use of this authority as a force multiplier in connection with our other surveillance tools.

Following are the Brennan QFR responses I mentioned.

Limitations on Drone Strikes

In the recently released, unclassified white paper, DOJ writes that "the United States retains its authority to use force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces outside of the area of active hostilities when it targets a senior operational leader of the enemy forces who is actively engaged in planning operations to kill Americans."

- Could the Administration carry out drone strikes inside the United States?

This Administration has not carried out drone strikes inside the United States and has no intention of doing so. I defer to the Departments of Justice and Defense on what legal authorities may apply to using military-level force inside the United States, but the United States only carries out drone strikes where other countries are unable or unwilling to address the threat posed by terrorists—and that is not an issue we have inside the United States.

- Could you describe the geographical limits on the Administration's conduct drone strikes?

As I noted in my speech at Harvard Law School in September 2011, and the Attorney General stated publicly last March, we do not view our authority to use military force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces in this conflict as being limited to "hot" battlefields like Afghanistan. Al-Qa'ida is a stateless enemy that can shift operations from country to country, and consequently al Qaeda and its associates have in the recent past directed several attacks against us from countries other than Afghanistan. The Government has a responsibility to protect against these attacks, and, thus, as the Attorney General has noted, "neither Congress nor our federal courts has limited the geographic scope of our ability to use force to the current conflict in Afghanistan."

This does not mean, however, that we use military force and conduct drone strikes whenever we want or wherever we want. International legal principles, such as respect for another nation's sovereignty, constrain our ability to act unilaterally. Consistent with international legal principles, however, we could use military force in foreign territory with, for example, the consent of the relevant nation—or if or when other governments are unwilling or unable to deal effectively with a threat to the United States.

Please let me know if you have questions.



Special Counsel
Office of Congressional Affairs

Room 7244 (for mail, use Room 7240)



~~SECRET_Surveillanc
eRpt_033012....~~

b6
b7C

=====
Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

=====
Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

=====
Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

From: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 10:16 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: RE: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: C71W88B15
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231

I talked to the ASC at SAS [REDACTED] used to work with him as a pilot at WFO)...that is probably class'ed as U/LES, per [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

From: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 9:32 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: FW: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: F93M45K93
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231

Hi [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

Where did you get the information below on the UAS use in the recent hostage crisis in Alabama? And what classification should that be? Thanks!

From: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 5:49 PM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: FW: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: C71W88B15
Derived From: Multiple Sources

~~Declassify On:~~ 20381231

<< File: 2013 BAR (2).pdf >>

Page 58-60 of the Bureau Aviation Regulations (BAR)-attached- outlines the FBI's use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS's).

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

b7E

They were used in the recent Hostage taking in AL, and are currently being used for [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Please let me know if you need any more information.

Thanks-

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

From: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)

Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 3:21 PM

To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)

Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI);

[REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)

Subject: RE: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

~~Classified By: J78J13T65~~

~~Derived From: Multiple Sources~~

~~Declassify On: 20381231~~

Also from the hot wash: you recalled the Director being asked a question about domestic drone strikes or something similar. I thought I recalled something like that too. This is what I was thinking of:

At HAC-CJS hearing on 3/7/12, the Director was asked about the domestic applicability of criteria the AG had discussed in an academic forum re extra-territorial use of lethal force against U.S. citizens. Earlier that week, 03/05/12, the AG had given a speech at Northwestern University School of Law and discussed criteria where a U.S. citizen could be targeted overseas. The back-drop to this was the drone strike against al-Awlaki. Earlier this month, Feb. 2013, NBC news reported on this extra-territorial criteria in response to a "leaked DOJ white paper" that they had recently obtained. The issue also came up in the Brennan confirmation hearings. Below is the relevant portion from the 2012 hearing transcript. If this is not the question posed to the Director that you were thinking of, let me know and I will look further. thanks

<< File: hac030712.docx >>

From: [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 11:48 AM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Subject: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET~~/NOFORN

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET~~//NOFORN

~~Classified By: C45W77B94~~
~~Derived From: Multiple Sources~~
~~Declassify On: 20381231~~
=====

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C
b7E

During the Hotwash, I mentioned a report re: FBI surveillance capacity. The classified report is attached.

On page 4 of the report is this:

(U//FOUO) In remote locations where manned aircraft are deemed too detectable, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) platforms can be used to provide surveillance capabilities. The recently enacted Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-95) requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish rules that would allow law enforcement access to specific airspace within the continental United States for certain aircraft, including UAVs. The FBI will work with the Department of Justice and partner law enforcement agencies to pursue appropriate use of this authority as a force multiplier in connection with our other surveillance tools.

Following are the Brennan QFR responses I mentioned.

Limitations on Drone Strikes

In the recently released, unclassified white paper, DOJ writes that "the United States retains its authority to use force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces outside of the area of active hostilities when it targets a senior operational leader of the enemy forces who is activity engaged in planning operations to kill Americans."

- Could the Administration carry out drone strikes inside the United States?

This Administration has not carried out drone strikes inside the United States and has no intention of doing so. I defer to the Departments of Justice and Defense on what legal authorities may apply to using military-level force inside the United States, but the United States only carries out drone strikes where other countries are unable or unwilling to address the threat posed by terrorists—and that is not an issue we have inside the United States.

- Could you describe the geographical limits on the Administration's conduct drone strikes?

As I noted in my speech at Harvard Law School in September 2011, and the Attorney General stated publicly last March, we do not view our authority to use military force against al-Qa'ida and associated forces in this conflict as being limited to "hot" battlefields like Afghanistan. Al-Qa'ida is a stateless enemy that can shift operations from country to country, and consequently al Qaeda and its associates have in the recent past directed several attacks against us from countries other than Afghanistan. The Government has a responsibility to protect against these attacks, and, thus, as the Attorney General has noted, "neither Congress nor our federal courts has limited the geographic scope of our ability to use force to the current conflict in Afghanistan."

This does not mean, however, that we use military force and conduct drone strikes whenever we want or wherever we want. International legal principles, such as respect for another nation's sovereignty, constrain our ability to act unilaterally. Consistent with international legal principles, however, we could use military force in foreign territory with, for example, the consent of the relevant nation—or if or when other governments are unwilling or unable to deal effectively with a threat to the United States.

Please let me know if you have questions.

[redacted]
Special Counsel
Office of Congressional Affairs

[redacted]
Room 7244 (for mail, use Room 7240)
<< File: ~~SECRET~~ SurveillanceRpt_033012.pdf >>

=====
Classification: ~~SECRET~~ // NOFORN

b6
b7c

From: [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 4:15 PM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (DO) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: J78J43T20
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231

=====

SPU:

Per our discussion in the unit meeting, our [REDACTED] MAGNIFICENT SPECIAL COUNSEL, already located info on the drone matter! Let's keep in touch w/him too on this matter for any additional info. [REDACTED] you and I will meet in the morning to discuss further.

UC [REDACTED]
Special Projects Unit
Office of Congressional Affairs
Office [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]

b6
b7C

From: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2013 3:21 PM
To: [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI)
Cc: BEERS, ELIZABETH RAE (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OCA) (FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI);
[REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO)(FBI); [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Report re: FBI Surveillance Capacity --- ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

b6
b7C

Classification: ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Classified By: J78J13T65
Derived From: Multiple Sources
Declassify On: 20381231

=====

Also from the hot wash: you recalled the Director being asked a question about domestic drone strikes or something similar. I thought I recalled something like that too. This is what I was thinking of:

At HAC-CJS hearing on 3/7/12, the Director was asked about the domestic applicability of criteria the AG had discussed in an academic forum re extra-territorial use of lethal force against U.S. citizens. Earlier that week, 03/05/12, the AG had given a speech at Northwestern University School of Law and discussed criteria where a U.S. citizen could be